DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 988 UD 017 862

AUTHOR Lamy, Paul
TITLE Education and "Survivance": French Language Education and Linguistic Assimilation.
PUB DATE Dec 77
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Association of Sociology and Anthropology (Calgary, Alberta, December, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnicity; Family Environment; *French; *Language of Instruction; Language Research; *Language Role; *Language Usage; Mass Media; Post Secondary Education; Social Environment; *Sociolinguistics; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *French Canadians; Ontario (Ottawa)

ABSTRACT

In this paper the impact of French language education on linguistic assimilation among Canadian francophone minorities outside of Quebec is assessed. The Study of Adult Recurrent Education, conducted in 1974-75, was the data set used in the study. The sample was selected from a target population of those persons 18 years of age and older in the Ottawa Census Metropolitan Area. The sub-sample of persons of French mother constituted the universe examined. French language education was found to be an important barrier to the linguistic assimilation of francophones in the Ottawa area. In addition, language of instruction was found to have a cumulative impact ranging from modest to strong on the language spoken at home, with friends, at work, language of exposure to the mass media, inner speech, dominant language, and ethnic identity. Various conclusions were reached including the fact that: the language of instruction has a strong impact on the language of inner speech, expecially at the elementary level; language of inner speech, in turn, correlates strongly with the language spoken at home, with friends, and to a lesser extent, with dominant language and ethnic identity; and language of instruction at the secondary and postsecondary levels is more important in terms of language use at work and vis-a-vis the mass media. This paper contains quantified, theoretical, and ethnographic information. (Author/GC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED148988

EDUCATION AND "SURVIVANCE"

FRENCH LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND LINGUISTIC ASSIMILATION

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Paul Lamy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paul Lamy

Department of Sociology

University of Ottawa

Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Western Association of Sociology and Anthropology, Calgary, Alberta, (December) 1977.

UDO 17862

EDUCATION AND "SURVIVANCE":*

FRENCH LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND LINGUISTIC ASSIMILATION*

Introduction

The effectiveness of French-language educational institutions as a barrier to the linguistic assimilation of Francophone minorities outside of Quebec has too often been assumed rather than demonstrated. The various pressure groups of the Francophone minorities have pushed long and hard to maximize the availability and scope of French-language instruction; the federal government provides significant support through the Department of Secretary of State to the provinces for instruction in the minority official languages. Underlying these efforts is the tacit or explicit assumption that there is a strong causal link between French-language instruction and the linguistic survival of the Francophone minorities. With regard to other Canadian ethnic groups, Reitz (1974: 120) reports that it is the use of the ethnic language in the home which is strongly related to language retention and that "ethnic school attendance had little additional effect". However, the comparison of non-official language groups with official language minorities is tenuous, at best. The effects of French-language instruction may be much stronger than the effects of ethnic schooling for members of non-official language groups given 1) qualitative and quantitative differences in the kind of education delivered and 2) the greater structural opportunities for and inducements towards the use of official languages outside of the school context. The importance of social context is indicated by Vallee and Shulman (1969: 92) who have

*The research on which this paper is based was carried out under contract for the Ontario Ministry of Education. Support for further analysis was provided by the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ottawa.

reported that "resistance to assimilation is highest where the French element possesses the most complete set of institutions and a large measure of control over the kinds of resources which contribute to group autonomy". Vallee and Shulman (1969), however, do not attempt to assess the impact of each of the various kinds of social institutions (church, school, mass media, etc.) on linguistic assimilation. The purpose of this study is to assess the impact of French language education on linguistic assimilation. Canadian sociological research in the "institutional completeness" tradition suggests that this impact should be positive and of some strength.

Data Source and Methods

Much research on linguistic assimilation has the major shortcoming of providing rather narrow and weak measures of this concept. While, as in most areas of social science research, there is little agreement as to how linguistic assimilation should be formally defined, most specialists would consider that a person who no longer uses his or her mother tongue, who no longer speaks that language best, and who no longer thinks in that language to have become assimilated linguistically to another language community. The more one moves away from this extreme, the lesser the degree of agreement as to the kind and degree of linguistic assimilation. Nonetheless, operationalizations of the concept span three basic areas: language use, language dominance, and inner speech. Language use, language dominance and language of inner speech may vary accross domains of use (i.e. home, work, school). Just as a person may use French at home and English at work, so may a person be more proficient in French when discussing matters related to family life and more proficient in English when discussing matters pertaining to work; a person may also think about things related to family life in French and in English about things pertaining to work. Language use may vary not only across but within domains of use, and

may further vary within particular domains of use 1) at the level of language input and language output and 2) according to the mode (oral and written) of language input or output. As if the situation were not sufficiently complex, classifications of domains of use seem as numerous and varied as the socio-linguists who use them.

In choosing the dependent variables for this study, the guiding principle was that measures of language use, language dominance, and language of inner speech should be included since these areas of concern are basic to theory and research on linguistic assimilation. Given the limits in the array of dependent variables to choose from, measures of the language spoken at home, with friends, and at work were chosen as measures of language use; in addition, a measure of language of exposure to the mass media was created by means of a scored variable based on language use vis-à-vis radio, television, and newspapers. Dominant language is measured by means of a question asking the respondent which language he or she feels more comfortable speaking (no domains of use were specified). Language of inner speech is measured by means of a question asking which language the respondent uses when he or she sits back and thinks about things (no domains of use were specified). Finally, a measure of ethnic identity was included as a dependent variable. The independent variables are measures of the language of instruction at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels; a scored variable is used to assess cumulative effects.

The Study of Adult Recurrent Education carried out by the York Survey Research Center for the author in late 1974 and early 1975 is the data set used here. The sample was selected by means of a multi-stage, stratified,

clusterd procedure with the target population being those persons 18 years of age and older in the Ottawa Census Metropolitan Area; 401 interviews were conducted, 202 of them with persons of French mother tongue. The sub-sample of persons of French mother constitutes the universe examined herein. A parametric strategy is adopted for the analysis of the data though the variables are either ordinal, or nominal dichotomies (see Fn.). In the tradition of Labovitz (1970), it is argued that the error involved in applying procedures applicable to interval scales only is counter-balanced, in this instance, by the benefits yielded by the use of more powerful and clearly interpretable statistics; secondly, as Kim (1975) has shown, ordinal multivariate techniques do not resolve the basic problems of measurement and, as Reynolds (1977) has shown, neither do log-linear techniques. Pearson's r is used as a measure of association and partial correlations are used to control for the province in which education was received (Ontario, Quebec), socio-economic status (revised Blishen score), age and sex.

Social Context: A Missing Intervening Variable

The effects of French-language education most probably vary from one social context to the other or, otherwise put, with the extent to which structural factors permit the actual use of the French language in every-day life. It will be seen that the language use, dominant language, and language of inner speech variables are all in positive correlation with each other in strengths varying from modest to strong. It seems reasonable to assume that the lack of use of a language is accompanied by decreasing fluency in it, and that lack of use and decreasing fluency tend to be accompanied by decreased use of the language in inner speech. Therefore , it seems probable that the effects of French-language education would not be as strong in Hamilton or Toronto

as in Ottawa (despite a high degree of similarity in the kind and quality of the French-language instruction dispensed) because of the sharp differences in the possibilities of using French. An ideal data set would be one which furnished samples of Francophones in sufficient numbers to permit both the social context, preferably at the community level, and the kind of French-language education delivered to be varied. However, survey research on Francophone minorities west of Quebec is a very costly affair indeed and such a data set is not likely to make its appearance in the imminent future. The Ottawa C.M.A. study does, however, permit the kind (and place) of French-language education delivered to be varied since 30% of the sample were educated in Québec.

Since it is not possible to vary social context and since its probable importance as an intervening variable seems evident, a closer look at the Ottawa C.M.A. is warranted. First of all, it is within the Ottawa C.M.A. that Ontario's largest Francophone community is to be found -- 20.2% of Ontario Francophones live there though they constitute only 21.5% of the C.M.A. population. Ottawa is flanked to the southeast by the overwhelmingly Francophone county of Prescott-Russell and to the north, by the city of Hull, Québec. The Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario and the Fédération des Francophones hors Québec have their head offices in Ottawa; a good portion of the intellectual, artistic, political, and social elite of Ontario francophones is to be found there. Ottawa is part of the National Capital Area which has been declared, as of 1969, an officially bilingual disctrict. There exists an extensive French-language elementary and secondary educational systems and a bilingual university; there are also extensive adult education facilities offered in French at all levels. The only French-language daily in Ontario, Le Droit, is published in Ottawa. The major French-language

dailies from Quebec are available in most variety stores and at most newspaper stands of any significance. Magazines in French from Quebec and Europe are readily available to anyone who care to purchase them. Le Monde from France is as available as the New York Times. An abundance of French-language television and radio stations can be received in Ottawa and the variety in programming content would leave many a European francophone envious. There are innumerable clubs and associations of all kinds for francophones. The attitude of the anglophone community is probably the least hostile of any outside of Quebec. There is not only a bi-ethnic "Alliance for Bilingualism", a considerable number of anglophones have enrolled their children in bilingual immersion courses in French schools.

There is much more: through the efforts of the Ministry of Public Works and of the National Capital Commission, extensive and rapid progress has been made in terms of changes in the outward appearance of the capital. The federal government's overall language planning effort is directed from the national capital. This has been accompanied by several positive side-effects. The establishment of government language schools, among the largest in the world, resulted in an influx of well-educated and well-paid language teachers who have had considerable impact on the cultural tone of the capital. This has been reinforced by federal support of the performing arts and cultural activities in general. The Ottawa municipal government has tended to follow the federal lead and services are now available in both languages to a much greater extent than was the case a decade ago. The National Capital Commission has assisted the municipality of Ottawa in sharing the costs of simultaneous translation of public meetings and conferences. The Ottawa boards of education have promoted the study of French as a second language and both the proportion of students taking French and the amount of time devoted to instruction in that language are

higher than the provincial average. The federal government has contributed several million dollars towards the cost of immersion programs. The result has been a definite improvement in the outward appearance and atmosphere of the national capital, from a francophone perspective.

Even the status of French as a language of work appears to have improved. The expansion of services offered in both official languages by the various levels of government has opened up not only new employment opportunities at higher levels for francophones but also the opportunity to use French at work. Even in stores and restaurants, the availability of service in both languages has become increasingly widespread. However, the pressure to use English in the Ottawa C.M.A. work world is still strong. The best evidence of this is the use to which French is put in the city's biggest industry -- the federal administration: 7% of incumbents of public service positions in the national capital area use only French at work, 15.9% use both, while 66.4% use only English (there is no information for 10.7% of positions). (Chrétien, 1975).

The francophone community in Ottawa is clearly in a more fortunate position in terms of the abundance of supportive institutional infrastructure than are the other francophone minorities everywhere else in Canada outside of Quebec. No doubt the effects of French-language education are stronger there than in the other urban communities where francophones are in the minority. However, looking behind some of the impressive window-dressing financed by the various levels of government, the status of the French language and culture in Ottawa does not appear so sanguine: while 60.7% of those of French mother tongue speak French or mostly French at home add another 59.3% speak French or mostly French with close friends, only 23.3% speak

French at work. (Table 1) Of the three domains of home, friendship, and work, it is in the work situation that the use of the French language is weakest -- more persons of French mother tongue speak English or mostly English at work (34.6%) than French (23.3%), though 42.1% report that they use both languages equally at work. As for linguistic behaviour vis-à-vis the mass media, Ottawa francophones manifest a distinct preference for English-language newspapers and magazines (65.7%), radio (60.1%), and television (67.8%); this pattern exists despite the high quality, variety, and availability of French-language equivalents. While the use of French is strongest in the home and in friendship networks, English predominates in the work world and in francophone mass media preferences. Nonetheless, French remains firmly entrenched as the language of inner speech with 63.3% of francophones using French or mostly French in this domain of use; another 16.8% use both languages equally in inner speech while 19.9% report using English or mostly English. As for the language francophones feel more comfortable speaking (dominant language), only 50.8% feel more comfortable in French; 39.7% feel equally comfortable in both languages and only 9.5% feel more comfortable in English. Given the extensive use of English on the part of Ottawa francophones, it seems important to determine whether French-language schooling makes a difference.

Table 1 -- about here

French-Language Education and Linguistic Assimilation

If French-language schooling does make a difference in what use one makes of French, such effects should manifest themselves in Ottawa given the greater possibilities to use the language in most domains of use than is the case in most other francophone minority communities outside of Quebec. Most Ottawa francophones (78.1%) have received their elementary schooling in French, though this proportion declines to 51.6% at the secondary level and to 47.5% at the postsecondary level. The proportion of francophones educated in both languages increases at each level -- from 11.2% at the elementary level to 21% and 24.2% at the secondary and postsecondary levels, respectively (Table 2). A large minority (30%) of Ottawa francophones were educated in Quebec. The variety in both the language of education and province of education enhances the value of Ottawa as the focus of a community-level study.

Table 2 -- about here

It was found that the major impact of the language in which education is received is on the language of inner speech (Table 3). The relationship between the language of instruction and the language of inner speech is strongest at the elementary level (.427) and declines at the secondary (.380) and postsecondary (.289) levels; these effects are cumulative and the relationship between the language of instruction scored variable and the language

of inner speech is .611.

The language of inner speech is, in turn, a strong predictor of language spoken in the home (.664), language spoken with friends (.556), and a more modest predictor of dominant language (.497) and ethnic identity (.477). The impact of language of instruction on language of the home and languge spoken with friends is not as strong as might have been expected --.380 and .307, respectively. The language of instruction at the elementary level is more strongly correlated (.341) with language spoken at home than is the case of language of instruction at the secondary (.243) and postsecondary (.189) levels. The relationship between language of instruction and language spoken with friends is more consistent across the three levels of education (.299, .257, .349).

Table 3 - about here

While the language of instruction has the greatest impact on language of inner speech and on language spoken at home, it is particularly the language of instruction at the elementary level which is important. Language of instruction at the secondary and postsecondary levels, on the other hand, have the strongest impact on the language of work, the language of exposure to the mass media, dominant language, and ethnic identification. It would seem that the language of instruction at the elementary level is of greater import for more personal uses of language (i.e. in inner speech and in the home) while the language of instruction at the secondary and postsecondary levels if of greater importance in terms of language use in the more impersonal domains. The impact of

the language of instruction on the language of work rises with each higher level of education (.179,.185, .385); a similar trend occurs with regard to the relationship between the language of instruction and the language of exposure to the mass media (.110 at the elementary level, .148 at the secondary level, and .435 at the postsecondary level). Likewise, the impact of the language of instruction on dominant language and ethnic identity increases with educational level. Though the language of instruction at the elementary level has a strong impact on the language of thought, the content of education at this level is perhaps not sufficient to equip the individual to cope with the adult world in that language; the language used in coping with the world of work and the mass media tends to be the language in which one's secondary and postsecondary education were received.

To determine whether or not where respondents had received their education was of any importance, partial correlations were computed controlling for the province of education. It can be seen from Table 4 that it matters very little whether respondents were education in Ontario or in Quebec. There are two possibilities in this regard: on is that the difference between the educational systems of each province are of little relevance for linguistic behaviour; the second, and perhaps more plausible possibility, is that the differences between the two educational systems are considerably less important than the impact of the social context in which graduates of both systems find themselves. Socio-economic status is an intervening variable of minimal importance -- the partials are slightly higher than the zero-orders at each of the educational levels because educational background (the effects of which are cumulative) is taken into account in the index of socio-economic

status (Table 5). While the partials with age and sex controlled flutter above and below the zero-orders, these variations do not appear to be meaningful (Table 6).

Tables 4, 5, 6 -- about here

Summary and Discussion

French-language education is an important barrier to the linguistic assimilation of francophones in the Ottawa Census Metropolitan Area. Language of instruction has a cumulative impact ranging from modest to strong on the language spoken at home, with friends, at work, language of exposure to the mass media, inner speech, dominant language, and ethnic identity. The language of instruction has a strong impact on the language of inner speech; this effect is especially strong at the elementary level. Language of inner speech, in turn, correlates strongly with the language spoken at home, with friends, and to a lesser extent, with dominant language and ethnic identity. The language of instruction at the secondary and postsecondary levels are more important in terms of language use at work and vis-à-vis the mass media.

That the language of instruction at the lower levels of the educational system is a more important determinant of the language of thought (inner speech) seems compatible with the extensive research literature on second language learning reporting that younger learners acquire fluency in a second

language more easily and rapidly and are more able to acquire a native-like accent. Penfield (1967) provides a neurophysiological explanation of these observations; Balkan (1970) and Gardner and Lambert (1972) seem to argue that languages can be more readily internalized by younger learners due to factors associated with particular stages in the process of psychological development (in that they maintain, without grounding their hypotheses in a more global approach to psychological development, that language learning involves identification with the other language group and younger learners are more able to do this). It would appear, then, that elementary education is of considerable importance in determining the language one uses in inner speech, perhaps because students at this level are at a stage of psychological development at which they are more readily able to internalize symbolic systems in general. Inner speech is a particularly important domain of language use in that, as Vygotsky (1961) has pointed out, it is through inner speech that the self-regulation of behaviour is conducted; the linguistic system which we use in inner speech is not only the language in which we talk to our selves, but the language through which we conceive of our selves (Mead, 1934).

The extent to which the language of inner speech is made the language of use in other domains probably depends primarily on structural factors facilitating or impeding (in the "reward for" as well as the "able to" sense) the use of that language as an effective social tool. The degree of institutional completeness of minority language communities is likely to have much to do with opportunities to use the minority language (Breton, 1964; Vallee and Shulman, 1969); of at least equal importance, however, are other structural factors such as the size of the minority and majority communities

the degree of residential dispersion and social differentiation of the minority language group, and the kind and extent of discrimination on the part of the majority (Blau, 1977; Maxwell, 1977); lastly, the extent to which underlying attitudes and values reinforce or undermine structural patterns is of some importance. Otherwise put, while the language of instruction, especially at the elementary level has a considerable impact on the language of inner speech, and lesser effects on language use in other domains, social context is of crucial importance in determining language use and hence the magnitude of the effects of language of instruction (this is asserted here rather than demonstrated since only one community has been studied). To illustrate, while a French-language education, particularly at the elementary level, may considerably enhance the possibility that students in the system will use French in inner speech and other domains of use later in life, this possibility is reduced to the extent that there are structural impediments to the use of the language; fluency in languages that are not used tends to decline; as use and fluency decline, it seems probable that the use of another language in inner speech increases. For these reasons, French-language education is not likely to be a sufficient barrier to linguistic assimilation in such communities as Hamilton, Toronto, and Windsor. Given the differences in the quantity and quality of ethnic schooling among the non-official language groups, sharper structural impediments (in most instances) to the use of non-official languages, and the indifferent or negative attitudes of the official language majorities, it is not surprising that the link between ethnic schooling and language retention is rather weak among the non-official language groups (Reitz, 1974).

REFERENCES

Balkan, Louis
1970 "Les différences qualitatives de la maîtrise linguistique selon l'âge de l'apprentissage de la deuxième langue: aspects affectifs et convenance linguistique". Revue de l'Institut de Sociologie (Solvay) 1: 137-144.

Blau, Peter
1977 "A Macrosociological Theory of Social Structure". American Journal of Sociology 83:26-54.

Breton, Raymond
1964 "Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants". American Journal of Sociology LXX: 193-205.

Chrétien, The Honourable Jean
1975 "Measures Introduced to Increase the Use of French in the Public Service of Canada". Ottawa: Treasury Board of Canada.

D'Costa, Ronald
1975 "La population franco-ontarienne: quelques aspects démographiques". Pp. 83-100 in Pierre Savard (ed.), Situation de la recherche sur la vie française en Ontario. Ottawa: ACFAS.

Gardner, R.C. and W.E. Lambert
1972 Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

La Fédération des francophones hors Québec
1977 Les Héritiers de Lord Durham. Ottawa: FFQH.

Kim, Jae-On
1975 "Multivariate Analysis of Ordinal Variables". American Journal of Sociology 81: 261-298.

Labovitz, Sanford
1977 "The Assignment of Numbers to Rank Order Categories". American Sociological Review 35: 515-524

Lamy, Paul
1977 "The Validity of the 1971 Census Language Data". Pp. 39-53 in Paul Lamy (ed.) Language Maintenance and Language Shift in Canada: New Dimensions in the Use of Census Language Data. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Lévesque, Gérard
1977 Pourquoi un conseil scolaire de langue française pour la région d'Ottawa-Carleton ? Ottawa: L'Association française des Conseils scolaires de l'Ontario.

Mead, George Herbert
1934 Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maxwell, Thomas R.
1977 The Invisible French: The French in Metropolitan Toronto. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Penfield, Wilder
1967 "The Learning of Languages". Pp. 192-214 in J. Michel (ed.), Foreign Language Teaching: An Anthology. New York: Macmillan.

Reitz, Jeffrey G.
1974 "Language and Ethnic Community Survival". Pp. 104-122 in Raymond Breton (ed.), Aspects of Canadian Society. Toronto: CSAA.

Reynolds, H.T.
1977 "Some Comments on the Causal Analysis of Surveys with Log-linear Models". American Journal of Sociology 83: 127-143.

Vallee, Frank G. and Norman Shulman
1969 "The Viability of French Groupings outside of Quebec". Pp. 83-99 in Mason Wade (ed.), Regionalism in the Canadian Community, 1867-1967. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Vygotsky, L.S.
1962 Thought and Language. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.

TABLE I

LANGUAGE USE PATTERNS AMONG THOSE OF FRENCH MOTHER TONGUE

IN THE OTTAWA CENSUS METROPOLITAN AREA (in %)

	Language spoken at home	Language spoken with friends	Language spoken at work	Language of last newspaper or magazine read	Language of last radio program	Language of last T.V. program	Language of inner speech	Dominant Language
French (or mostly French)	60.7	59.3	23.3	34.3	39.9	32.2	63.3	50.8
Both equally	19.9	8.0	42.1	---	---	---	16.8	39.7
English (or mostly English)	19.4	32.7	34.6	65.7	60.1	67.8	19.9	9.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(196)	(199)	(133)	(198)	(199)	(199)	(196)	(199)

TABLE 2 LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION AMONG THOSE OF FRENCH MOTHER TONGUE IN OTTAWA C.M.A. BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL (in %)

Language of Instruction	Educational Level		
	Elementary	Secondary	Post-secondary
French	78.1	51.6	43.5
Both Languages	11.2	21.0	24.2
English	10.7	27.4	32.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(196)	(157)	(62)

TABLE 3 CORRELATION MATRICE OF THE INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES*

	Language of instruction (elementary)	Language of instruction (secondary)	Language of instruction (postsecondary)	Language of instruction (scored variable)	Language spoken at home	Language spoken with friends	Language spoken at work	Language of exposure to the mass media	Language of inner speech	Dominant language	Ethnic identity
Language of instruction (Elementary Education)	1.000	.579	.278	.434	.341	.299	.179	.110	.427	.181	.131
Language of Instruction (Secondary Education)	.579	1.000	.404	.772	.243	.257	.185	.148	.380	.280	.190
Language of Instruction (Postsecondary Education)	.278	.404	1.000	.782	.189	.349	.385	.435	.289	.341	.338
Language of Instruction (Scored Variable)	.434	.722	.782	1.000	.380	.307	.329	.246	.611	.284	.301
Language spoken at home	.341	.243	.189	.380	1.000	.485	.327	.370	.664	.375	.304
Language spoken with friends	.299	.257	.349	.307	.485	1.000	.267	.445	.556	.416	.428
Language spoken at work	.179	.185	.385	.329	.327	.267	1.000	.369	.368	.337	.263
Language of exposure to the mass media (scored variable)	.110	.148	.435	.246	.370	.445	.369	1.000	.384	.400	.362
Language of inner speech	.427	.380	.289	.611	.664	.556	.368	.384	1.000	.497	.434
Language respondent feels most comfortable speaking	.181	.280	.341	.284	.375	.416	.337	.400	.497	1.000	.477
Ethnolinguistic identification	.131	.190	.338	.301	.304	.428	.263	.362	.434	.477	1.000

* All correlations (r) appearing in this table are statistically significant (.05 level).

TABLE 4 FIRST-ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION VARIABLES AND THE LANGUAGE USE VARIABLES CONTROLLING FOR PROVINCE IN WHICH EDUCATION WAS RECEIVED*

	LANGUAGE USE VARIABLES						
Language of Instruction Variables	Language spoken at home	Language spoken with friends	Language spoken at work	Language of exposure to the mass media	Language of inner speech	Dominant language	Ethnic identity
Language of Instruction (Elementary Education)	.341 (.341)	.295 (.299)	.172 (.179)	.096 (.110)	.432 (.427)	.169 (.181)	.121 (.131)
Language of Instruction (Secondary Education)	.244 (.243)	.251 (.257)	.175 (.185)	.128 (.148)	.388 (.380)	.264 (.280)	.175 (.190)
Language of Instruction (Postsecondary Education)	.190 (.189)	.342 (.349)	.374 (.385)	.413 (.435)	.304 (.289)	.315 (.341)	.318 (.338)
Language of Instruction (Scored Variable)	.381 (.380)	.302 (.307)	.322 (.329)	.291 (.246)	.618 (.611)	.324 (.284)	.330 (.301)

* The zero-order correlations appear underneath each partial correlation in parentheses.

TABLE 5 FIRST-ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION VARIABLES AND THE LANGUAGE USE VARIABLES CONTROLLING FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (REVISED BLISHEN SCORE)*

	LANGUAGE USE VARIABLES						
Language of Instruction Variables	Language spoken at home	Language spoken with friends	Language spoken at work	Language of exposure to the mass media	Language of inner speech	Dominant language	Ethnic identity
Language of Instruction (Elementary Education)	.349 (.341)	.317 (.299)	.182 (.179)	.115 (.110)	.433 (.427)	.185 (.181)	.132 (.131)
Language of Instruction (Secondary Education)	.260 (.243)	.291 (.257)	.193 (.185)	.160 (.148)	.395 (.380)	.291 (.280)	.194 (.190)
Language of Instruction (Postsecondary Education)	.200 (.189)	.377 (.349)	.393 (.385)	.447 (.435)	.298 (.289)	.349 (.341)	.342 (.338)
Language of Instruction (Scored Variable)	.380 (.380)	.307 (.307)	.328 (.329)	.233 (.246)	.610 (.611)	.272 (.284)	.291 (.301)

* The zero-order correlations appear underneath each partial correlation in parentheses.

TABLE 6 SECOND-ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION VARIABLES AND THE LANGUAGE USE VARIABLES CONTROLLING FOR AGE AND SEX*

	LANGUAGE USE VARIABLES						
Language of Instruction Variables	Language spoken at home	Language spoken with friends	Language spoken at work	Language of exposure to the mass media	Language of inner speech	Dominant language	Ethnic identity
Language of Instruction (Elementary Education)	.347 (.341)	.307 (.299)	.188 (.179)	.133 (.110)	.435 (.427)	.205 (.181)	.130 (.131)
Language of Instruction (Secondary Education)	.246 (.243)	.272 (.257)	.164 (.185)	.163 (.148)	.384 (.380)	.299 (.380)	.184 (.190)
Language of Instruction (Postsecondary Education)	.184 (.189)	.350 (.349)	.372 (.385)	.429 (.435)	.284 (.289)	.332 (.341)	.338 (.338)
Language of Instruction (Scored Variable)	.399 (.380)	.336 (.307)	.329 (.329)	.301 (.246)	.639 (.611)	.338 (.284)	.301 (.301)

* The zero-order correlations appear underneath each partial correlation in parentheses.